



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/654,907	09/05/2003	Valerie De La Poterie	05725.1236-00	6821

22852 7590 12/14/2006

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER  
LLP  
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

VENKAT, JYOTHSNA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1615

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/654,907	DE LA POTERIE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	JYOTHSNA A. VENKAT Ph. D	1615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-117 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-117 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-24 and 79-107 are, drawn to a cosmetic composition for coating keratin fibres comprising, in a cosmetically acceptable medium, at least one wax in an amount of at least 27% by weight classified in class 424, subclass 70.7.
- II. Claims 25-78 and 108-111 are, drawn to a composition for coating keratin fibres comprising, in a cosmetically acceptable medium, at least one wax having a tack of greater than or equal to 0.7 N.s and a hardness of less than or equal to 3.5 MPa, *and at least one compound chosen from dextrin esters of fatty acids and/or at least one filler having a BET specific surface area of greater than or equal to 100 m<sup>2</sup>/g* classified in class 424, subclass 70.1.
- III. Claim 112 is drawn to a non-therapeutic cosmetic process for making up keratin fibers materials at least one composition comprising, in a cosmetically acceptable medium, at least one wax in an amount of at least 27% by weight classified in class 424, subclass 70.7.
- IV. Claim 113 is drawn to a non-therapeutic process for making up keratin materials comprising applying to the keratin materials at least one composition comprising, in a cosmetically acceptable medium, at least one wax having a tack of greater than or equal to 0.7 N.s and a hardness of less than or equal to 3.5 MPa, and at least one compound chosen from dextrin esters of fatty acids and/or at least one

filler having a BET specific surface area of greater than or equal to 100 m<sup>2</sup>/g.

classified in class 424, subclass 70.7.

- V. Claim 114 is drawn to a process for *obtaining a charging and separating makeup result on the eyelashes* comprising applying to the eyelashes at least one composition comprising, in a cosmetically acceptable medium, at least one wax in an amount of at least 27% by weight, relative to the total weight of the composition, wherein said at least one wax has a tack of greater than or equal to 0.7 N.s and a hardness of less than or equal to 3.5 MPa classified in class 424, subclass 70.7.
- VI. Claim 115 is drawn to a process for *obtaining a charging and separating makeup result on the eyelashes* comprising applying to the eyelashes at least one composition comprising, in a cosmetically acceptable medium, at least one wax having a tack of greater than or equal to 0.7 N.s and a hardness of less than or equal to 3.5 MPa, and at least one compound chosen from dextrin esters of fatty acids and/or at least one filler having a BET specific surface area of greater than or equal to 100 m<sup>2</sup>/g classified in class 424, subclass 70.7.
- VI. Claims 116-117 are drawn to an assembly (1) for packaging and applying a product for coating keratin fibres, comprising: i) a container (2) containing the composition according to Claim 1, and ii) means (12), for applying the composition to the fibres classified in class 132, subclass 1+.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Art Unit: 1615

Inventions I and II are directed to distinct products. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed are mutually exclusive since composition I does not have wax and at least one compound. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants. It is an undue search burden to examine both the groups drawn to different scope.

Inventions I and III-VI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with film forming polymer like PVP/VA and also the process of use can be practiced with two different products of group I and group II.

Inventions VI and I are related as apparatus and product made. The inventions in this relationship are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the apparatus as claimed is not an obvious apparatus for making the product and the apparatus can be used for making a materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different apparatus (MPEP § 806.05(g)). In this case the product as claimed can

Art Unit: 1615

be practiced with an assembly containing a container and the container containing the composition and the container containing curved brush for coating the keratin fibers.

Although there are no provisions under the section for “Relationship of Inventions” in MPEP § 806.05 for inventive groups that are related to *different methods*, restriction is deemed proper because the methods appear to constitute patentable distinct inventions for the following reasons: Groups III-VI encompass methods that are distinct functionally and are not required one for the other. Groups III-VI utilize a product having wax, but comprise substantively different method steps and achieve different goals. Therefore search and examination of all the methods along with the product and another product and apparatus in one patent application would result in an undue burden, since the search for the three methods are not co-extensive.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

#### ***Election of Species***

*If applicants elect any group, they are further required to elect single disclosed species belonging to wax and also required to elect wax belonging to additional wax.*

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: belonging to wax. The wax can be natural wax or synthetic wax or it can be compounds of formula I.

The above compound, depending on the nature of wax can represent numerous patentably distinct compounds. It is an undue search burden to examine all the waxes.

**Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species** for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently claims 1,104, 108 and 112-116 are generic.

**Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added.** *An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.*

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and



Art Unit: 1615

specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103 (a) of the other invention.

#### ***Election of Species***

*If applicants elect group II, they are further required to elect single disclosed species belonging to dextrin esters of fatty acids or filler having a BET specific area.*

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: belonging to at least one compound. The at least compound, depending on the nature of the compound can represent numerous patentably distinct compounds since the compound can be a filler or dextrin esters of fatty acid esters belonging to formula II. It is an undue search burden to examine all the compounds

**Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species** for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently claim 25, 108 and 113 are generic.

**Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added.** *An argument that a claim is*

Art Unit: 1615

allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103 (a) of the other invention.

A telephone call was made to Thalia on Warnement 10/12/06 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Art Unit: 1615

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103 (a) of the other invention.


Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JYOTHSNA A. VENKAT Ph. D whose telephone number is 571-272-0607. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 10:30-7:30:1st Friday off.

Art Unit: 1615

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MICHAEL WOODWARD can be reached on 571-272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
**JYOTHSNA A VENKAT Ph. D**  
**Primary Examiner**  
**Art Unit 1615**